



HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Docket No.: 10001227-1
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Robert G. Gann

Application No.: 09/626,625

Confirmation No.: 1161

Filed: July 27, 2000

Art Unit: 2622

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR
CALIBRATING A LOOK-DOWN LINEAR
ARRAY SCANNER UTILIZING A FOLDED
OPTICAL PATH

Examiner: H. Safaipoor

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

MS Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The "Reasons for Allowance" provided by the Examiner state:

The instant invention recites a method of calibrating a look-down digital imaging device comprising:
focusing on a calibration area within the look-down digital imaging device;
scanning the calibration area within said look-down digital imaging device to capture image data for said calibration area;
analyzing said captured image data for said calibration area; and
adjusting the imaging of said look-down digital imaging device based on said analysis of said captured image data for said calibration area.

The features identified, in combination with other claim limitations, are neither suggested nor discussed by the prior art of record.

Application No.: 09/626,625

Docket No.: 10001227-1

In response, Applicant respectfully points out that the features noted by the Examiner appear to correspond to the elements of independent claim 1. Applicant notes that the other independent claims (claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 26, and 28) do not include all of the elements of claim 1. However, these other independent claims are of patentable merit based on their individual elements. Accordingly, the Examiner's specific statements in the reasons for allowance are not applicable to all of the claims, and should not be interpreted as such.

Also, the Examiner states in the reasons for allowance that the "features identified, in combination with other claim limitations, are neither suggested nor discussed by the prior art of record" (emphasis added). As mentioned above, the features identified appear to correspond to the elements of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully notes that the features identified are all of the elements contained in independent claim 1, and independent claim 1 is of patentable merit based on those recited features alone. Thus, the statement "in combination with other claim limitations" in the Examiner's reasons for allowance is inaccurate, as no further limitations need be combined with those of independent claim 1 for claim 1 to be of patentable merit.

In view of the above, the Examiner's reasons for allowance should not be interpreted as to limit the scope of the allowed claims.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Philip Lyren
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,709

Date: June 14, 05
Telephone No. (281) 514-8236